

June 21

If legislation along the lines here proposed is not enacted approximately two-thirds of the eligible persons who have entered training in the Philippines under the war orphans educational assistance program will have had but 3 years and 11 days in which to use their 36 months of entitlement. We believe that since the basic policy step of authorizing training in the Republic of the Philippines has already been taken, it is only proper to make the action meaningful by affording trainees in that country a full 5 years during which they might pursue this program. Accordingly, we would favor the enactment of this legislation.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of this administration's program to the presentation of this report to the committee.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, JR.,  
Administrator.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1961.

Hon. LISTER HILL,  
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public  
Welfare, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office  
Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for a report on S. 2051, a bill to afford children of certain deceased veterans who were eligible for the benefits of the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956 but who, because of residence in the Republic of the Philippines, were unable to receive such assistance prior to enactment of Public Law 85-460, additional time to complete their education.

The purpose of the bill appears to be to provide 5 full years of eligibility for educational assistance under the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956, as amended by Public Law 85-460, to certain war orphans who have entered training in the Philippines. Since such training has been authorized it would appear that the war orphans concerned should be given the full period of eligibility.

The Bureau of the Budget, therefore, does not object to the enactment of S. 2051.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,  
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, June 20, 1961.

Hon. LISTER HILL,  
Chairman, Senate Committee on Labor and  
Public Welfare, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of June 15, 1961, addressed to the Secretary of State, in which you request a statement of the position of this Department concerning S. 2051, a bill to afford children of certain deceased veterans who were eligible for the benefits of the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act of 1956 but who, because of residence in the Republic of the Philippines, were unable to receive such assistance prior to enactment of Public Law 85-460, additional time to complete their education.

Copies of a note from the Philippine Ambassador dated November 7, 1960, expressing the views of his government on this general subject were forwarded to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the Department on December 19, 1960. A copy of a second note from the Philippine Ambassador dated May 24, 1961, expressing the urgent interest of the Philippine Government in this matter and specifically endorsing H.R. 6268 (a bill similar to S. 2051), is enclosed for your information.

The Department of State believes that passage of S. 2051 would rectify, by extending

the period within which they may utilize their educational entitlement to a full 5 years from the date of the 1958 act, an apparent oversight in the 1958 legislation (Public Law 85-460) which extended educational assistance to eligible war orphans studying in the Philippines. The Department further believes, in view of the Philippine Ambassador's notes, and of comments received from the American Embassy in Manila, that this action would not only be of great benefit to the recipients but would also have favorable impact on U.S. relations with the Philippines.

For the above reasons, the Department of State supports the passage of S. 2051.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS,  
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2051) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the period referred to in section 1712 of title 38, United States Code, shall not end before June 18, 1963, with respect to pursuit of a program of education or special restorative training under chapter 35 of such title 38 by an eligible person who (1) had not reached his twenty-third birthday, on June 29, 1956, and (2) resided in the Republic of the Philippines during all, or part of the period June 29, 1956, through June 18, 1958.*

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his very fine cooperation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

#### REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 148) opposing Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1961.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senate now proceeding under controlled time to consider the reorganization plan?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As of now the time will be controlled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Five hours are allotted each side, if it is desired that the time be used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not hear the Presiding Officer. Is the Senate operating on controlled time now?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was so advised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is yielding time for the opposition.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The opposition, I understand, are those who are opposed to the resolution. As I understand, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] represents the proponents of the resolution. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct. I understood the Chair to mean opposition to the plan. But the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the Senate now operating under the time limitation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

#### THE FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several weeks ago our distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] delivered a fine and perceptive address urging the Congress and the executive branch of the government to act promptly in setting up an institution for training in cold war tactics, to be known as the Freedom Academy.

At this point there is no place in or out of the government where a full scale study of Communist methods and the best way of counteracting them can be comprehensively carried out. Policy makers and Government executives on all levels are handicapped by the lack of coordinated training and efforts along these lines.

Fighting communism is not a spare-time hobby. It is a full-time, 24-hour-a-day, 365-day-a-year job. The sooner the American people and the American Government realize this fact, the better able we will be to fight the cold war with vigor and success. Establishment of the Freedom Academy would fill an important gap in our Government training programs. For that reason, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill (S. 822) that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has introduced to set up such an institution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the address of the Senator from South Dakota printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HON. KARL E. MUNDT, U.S. SENATOR FROM SOUTH DAKOTA, AT THE FREEDOM INSTITUTE CONVOCATION, ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY, MAY 13, 1961

THE FREEDOM ACADEMY AND OUR AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

It was said many years ago by a venerable philosopher that "there is nothing new under the sun." The longer I live and the more I observe and ponder the development and course of mankind, the more convinced I

am of the truth contained in these few words.

For generations—in fact, throughout the entire history of the human species—men have been extolling the virtue of freedom and its essentiality to the spiritual, intellectual and corporeal development and advancement of man. That in part is our mission here today, but more importantly our task is to expound and deliberate on the preservation and extension of freedom. We have come to save freedom, not to praise it. As it is true that men throughout history have extolled freedom, so it is also true that since the beginning of man there have been those who have assailed and assaulted freedom and its institutions. Our generation has not been spared this anguish although in relative terms the threat to freedom today posed by Soviet-Sino communism is perhaps no greater than many of the threats and challenges which freedom has faced in the past. I say this not in an effort to minimize the proportions of the threat to freedom's existence today, but rather to emphasize the historical lesson that the quantity and quality of the assault upon freedom are not nearly as important to the outcome of the contest as are the quantity and quality of freedom's response to that assault.

Here at the Freedom Institute of St. John's University, as much and probably more than at any other American seat of learning, you have given effective recognition to this basic truism which has become so important to our survival as a self-governing country and as a free people. It is as a consequence of this fact that I am so honored by your recognition here today and so happy for the opportunity to address you on a vital topic which is of such urgent concern to all of us.

Let me now take you back 2,400 years to another occasion in history when freedom and civility and the dignity of man were under grievous assault. I refer, of course, to that period in history when the independence and freedom of ancient Greece were under attack from the barbarian hordes of Philip II of Macedon. One man, perhaps the greatest political orator of ancient Greece, Demosthenes, strove with every ounce of his forensic capacity to alert his fellowmen to the danger and to convince them that they must prepare and equip themselves to meet the Macedonian challenge to their independence. The greatest exhortations of Demosthenes were delivered in a series of epic speeches—the famous Philipics. So that no one will question the appropriateness of my comparing our present situation to that of ancient Greece, let me quote a few lines from the Third Philippic, in which Demosthenes offered his assessment of the challenge then confronting Athens: "If now we were all agreed that Philip is at war with Athens and infringing the peace, nothing would a speaker need to urge or advise but the safest and easiest way of resisting him. But since, at the very time when Philip is capturing cities and retaining divers of our dominions and assailing all people, there are men so unreasonable as to listen to repeated declarations in the assembly that some of us are kindling war, one must be cautious and set this matter right: for whoever moves or advises a measure of defense is in danger of being accused afterward as author of the war.

"I will first then examine and determine this point, whether it be in our power to deliberate on peace or war. If the country may be at peace, if it depends on us (to begin with this), I say we ought to maintain peace, and I call upon the affirmant to move a resolution, to take some measure, and not to palter with us. But if another, having arms in his hand and a large force around him, amuses you with the name of peace while he carries on the operations of war, what is left but to defend yourselves?

"You may profess to be at peace, if you like, as he does; I quarrel not with that. But if any man supposes this to be a peace, which will enable Philip to master all else and attack you last, he is a madman, or he talks of a peace observed toward him by you, not toward you by him. This it is that Philip purchases by all his expenditure, the privilege of assailing you without being assailed in turn."

Do you not agree that this commentary and analysis by Demosthenes is startlingly apropos to the circumstances currently besetting the free world? Replace the name Philip with the name Khrushchev and these words from 24 centuries in the past might with propriety and accuracy be delivered today by the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations General Assembly.

But let us not dwell on the words alone; let us briefly examine the events of that ancient day that preceded, prompted, and followed their utterance. The third Philippic culminated 10 years of effort by Demosthenes to awaken the Athenians from their complacency and to inspire them to action for the defense of their freedom and independence. It is significant to note that the first Philippic, spoken early in 351 B.C., was no sudden note of alarm drawing attention to an unnoticed peril. On the contrary, the assembly was weary of the subject, and the war with Philip of Macedon, which had already been in progress for 6 years, had become the theme of barren talk. Yet the Athenians could not bestir themselves to vigorous and enlightened action.

Were these the only aspects of the Athenian experience akin to our challenge of today, I would not presume on your time to recount these events from history. But there are other similarities so striking that this whole experience of the past obliges our attention, for there is, indeed, a lesson to be learned.

Take for example the fact that Athens, in 341 B.C., was enjoying the richest civilization yet known to man at that time, while the subjects of Philip II were for the most part uneducated and indigent peasants and shepherds. Add to this the fact that Philip achieved his conquests through new warfare concepts, utilizing highly-trained and rigidly disciplined militiamen, and through artful diplomacy that wooed both the unenlightened and the nonresolute into his camp.

Need I go further? Are we not the beneficiaries of the wealthiest society in the history of mankind? Are not vast numbers of those under the dominion of Soviet-Sino communism uneducated and pitifully poor peasants? Have not assemblies throughout the free world wearied of speeches on the conflict between freedom and communism? Has not this conflict become the theme of barren talk? Has not the beguiling diplomacy of the Soviets succeeded in mesmerizing and neutralizing many of the unenlightened and the nonresolute? And most importantly, have not the Communists expanded the perimeters of their tyranny through the skillful utilization of a newly-conceived form of integrated military and nonmilitary warfare, which employs highly trained and rigidly disciplined cadres as its chief agents of execution?

The manifest aggressions of Soviet communism against the free world have now proceeded virtually without important setback for 16 years. Suffice it to say that the Third Philippic by Demosthenes was delivered 16 years after Philip's first advance on Athens. That epic oration finally succeeded in enspiriting Athens and in bringing the Greek city-states together. But their tardy reconciliation and dilatory preparation was not sufficient to meet the crushing force of Macedon, and history records that Greek independence ended tragically 3 years later in 338 B.C.

Will we ignore the lessons of history and the realities of our time; or will we prepare at once to defend freedom against those who amuse us with the name of peace while carrying on the operations of war against us?

I am confident that your presence here today at this convocation of a great educational institution, which symbolizes and exemplifies the grandest traditions of a free society and which has pioneered so fruitfully with this Freedom Institute, leaves no doubt that you are joined with the affirmant and resolute who say, "Let us take those positive and demanding steps which are necessary for the preservation and extension of freedom."

I am a Member of the U.S. Senate, an elected representative of a free citizenry. As such, it is my task and my obligation to advocate a variety of causes and to minister to a multitude of needs. It is the frustration of every elected legislator that the manifold responsibilities of his vocation preclude his development or maintenance of an expertise in any particular scientific field or occupational endeavor. I do not, therefore, present myself to you as one inclined to speak with an expert's certitude on all the steps which must be taken in this hour of peril for the preservation and extension of freedom. I do, however, come before you as an earnest advocate for one step which I consider of paramount importance to the successful defense of freedom.

This step, which I recommend with every ounce of my conviction, is the immediate establishment of a national institution wherein free men could be educated in the multiple and complex aspects of Communist ideology, tactics, and strategy and intensively trained in the broad spectrum of arts, skills and knowledge required for effective operational activity in the global conflict between freedom and totalitarian communism.

This idea has been drafted into a legislative bill, which has been introduced in both Houses of Congress and which proposes the creation of a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy charged with the research, development and training responsibilities needed to provide the public and private sector with comprehensively trained personnel. Lest there be any misconceptions as to my assessment of the role which the Freedom Academy can play in the conflict between freedom and communism, let me hasten to emphasize that I most certainly do not look upon this agency and the functions it will execute as an easy panacea to our problems or an all-inclusive patent medicine for ridding the world of Communist tyranny. It is only one of a series of steps which must be taken so that this Nation and our free world allies can seize the initiative in the cold war conflict.

Perhaps my enthusiasm for this particular step is colored in part by my 2 years of association with the Freedom Academy idea, but I do sincerely feel that the establishment of this training and development institution is of paramount importance to the substantial and meaningful improvement of this Nation's cold war capabilities. I am joined in this conviction by the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, who in reporting the Freedom Academy bill to the U.S. Senate during the 86th Congress, said: "The committee considers this bill to be one of the most important ever introduced in the Congress. This is the first measure to recognize that a concentrated development and training program must precede a significant improvement in our cold war capabilities. The various agencies and bureaus can be shuffled and reshuffled. Advisory committees, interdepartmental committees, and coordinating agencies can be created and recreated, but until they are staffed by highly motivated personnel who have been systemati-

cally and intensively trained in the vast and complex field of total political warfare, we can expect little improvement in our situation."

Viewed in this light, I think the Freedom Academy becomes a far more appealing and plausible idea to those who might instinctively react against it, either because they oppose the creation of new Government agencies or because they see this new agency infringing on the activities of the existing agencies in the national security complex. Let me assure you that this is not a make-work proposal. Neither is it our intention that this new agency should infringe or encroach upon the functions or operational activities of any existing agencies in either the public or the private sector. It is because the functions envisioned for the Freedom Academy are not being done anywhere and because there is a vital need for them to be done that we have advanced this proposal in the Congress of the United States.

The Federal Government is today spending five-eighths of its annual budget or slightly more than \$50 billion for equipment and activities directly related to national security. I think it is fair to say that this massive expenditure of our national treasure is probative evidence that our governmental leaders are acutely aware that Soviet-Sino communism poses a formidable threat to the survival of our Nation. Of this total \$50 billion expenditure approximately \$48 billion are being spent for military requirements and other defense needs. We must, of course, maintain strong and modern armaments, and although I wish it were otherwise, I do not begrudge the expenditure of one defense dollar for I recognize the essentiality of this disbursement. But let us not fail to recognize that while these expenditures are preparing us for the eventualities of a hot war—which, thank God, we are not fighting—they are contributing precious little to our preparations for the cold war, which we are fighting at this very moment in every corner of the world.

We are not only fighting this cold war; we are losing it. If anyone doubts the truth of this commentary, they have only to look to Czechoslovakia, to East Germany, to Hungary, to mainland China, and to the island of Cuba only 90 miles from our continental boundaries. These are all areas which have been swept into the Communist sphere since the end of World War II—only 16 years ago. While it is true that Soviet military action played a part in bringing some of these areas behind the Iron Curtain, the fact cannot be ignored that the military aspects of these and other conquests were far less instrumental in bringing about the final result than were the nonmilitary aspects.

What, you may ask, do I mean by the nonmilitary aspects of these Communist conquests? I refer to the well-defined and highly systematized warfare concept developed by the Communists, which utilizes, interrelates and coordinates a multiple arsenal of manipulatory skills, including subversion, infiltration, ideological persuasion, diplomatic blackmail, propaganda, and coups d'etat. With the integration of political, ideological, psychological, economic, organizational and paramilitary skills into a single, artistically coordinated warfare concept, the Communists have conceived an entirely new dimension of conflict which, operating on a foundation of military strength, paralyzes the enemy with the threat of armed combat but conquers him without the use of a shooting conflict.

The mere development of this new concept of nonmilitary aggression would, of course, be valueless to its architects without the trained artisans to apply it, and the Communists have, indeed, not overlooked this essential feature in their total program for world conquest.

For the past 40 years the Communists have been engaged in a deliberate and carefully planned political warfare training program. Today the Soviets are operating an extensive network of political warfare training schools at Moscow, Leningrad, Tashkent, Prague, and elsewhere on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Some of these schools specialize in the training of nationals from outside the Iron Curtain. The Prague center specializes in training Latin Americans and Africans, and it is worth noting that this center has increased its training tempo since 1956. The school at Tashkent trains Communists from the Islamic countries. The training in these centers is both intensive and comprehensive; it is designed to produce a knowledgeable and hardened political warfare combatant, who can effectively execute the marching orders issued by the managers of protracted conflict. It is these individuals, my friends—these practitioners of conflict doctrine—these cadres of tyranny—who have brought Moscow and Peking victory after victory over the past 16 years—each one narrowing the perimeters of freedom. Speaking to this very point, the Senate Judiciary Committee Report of 1960 on the Freedom Academy bill observed with frightened accuracy that "the Communists have conquered nearly a billion people during a period when their sphere was markedly inferior in industry, technology, science, and military capabilities—in fact, inferior in almost everything except power-seeking know-how."

It is this power-seeking know-how of the Communists and its tactical, ideological, strategic, and organizational elements, which we in the free world must understand in its most minute detail. Not so we can mimic it, but rather so we can develop the operational skills and frame our positive programs to effectively counter and defeat its carnivorous thrusts inside the boundaries of freedom. In a nutshell this will be the mission of the Freedom Academy.

Perhaps with this talk of conflict and political warfare, I am building a misimpression that our sole national objective is to bring about the resounding and eternal defeat of totalitarian communism. If this be so let me immediately set the record straight.

Our Nation is one of the few and possibly the only one in the history of the world which was founded on an ideal. That ideal has been phrased and rephrased countless times by philosophers and statesmen, by scholars and judges, by theologians, and poets. Its essence is this: That God created individuals, not states, and it is the individual, be he white or black, red or yellow, who is supreme. It is, therefore, the function of a government or a nation to promote and preserve a climate of freedom, justice, order, equality and civility, in which the individual can develop his intellectual and spiritual talents for his benefit and the benefit of all mankind.

A nation and its citizenry endowed with such a magnificent birthright would, indeed, be false to that birthright if its goals were limited merely to the protection and preservation of that glorious heritage within its national boundaries. I have no fear that we will violate the trust reposed in us by our national traditions, for I sense in America today a people who are earnest in their desire to share this noble heritage with all men, so that they, too, may enjoy the fruits of freedom, equality, and justice. This then is the primal objective of America. But to pursue this objective we must survive and to survive we must destroy the tyranny that seeks to devour us.

Conflict and warfare are not comfortable topics of discussion and deliberation for Americans. We are inherently a peaceful society, and whether it be hot war or cold

war, the more contemplation of such action is repugnant to our nature. Perhaps it is even easier for us to come to grips with the realities of a hot war than a cold war, for a response to an enemy assaulting you with bullets and bombs seems to lend itself less painfully to ethical rationalization than does a response to an enemy assaulting you with subversion and diplomatic blackmail.

But, my friends, this is not a time for those seeking easy routes, comfortable solutions and painless remedies. If we are to achieve our national goals, we must come to grips with the stark realities of our time. Our situation today as a Nation is not unlike that of an individual blessed with great humanitarian instinct and skilled in the arts of resuscitation, who comes face to face with the fact that if he is to utilize his talents to the fullest, he must on occasion swim treacherous waters to rescue a drowning child. If we are sincere in our desires to utilize our talents as a Nation in assisting other people to attain their just aspirations for a better life, we then must be willing to swim the treacherous waters of international ideological conflict.

I see little evidence of our lack of will to make the swim, but I see much evidence of our lack of preparation for this perilous undertaking. I have already emphasized the fact that the Communists have literally thousands of hardened political warfare combatants in the field, who have been systematically and rigorously trained in a vast network of political warfare training institutions. By contrast, we have only a handful of individuals on our side with an equivalent knowledge and sophistication in the complex arts of political warfare, and those that we have—if I might borrow a phrase from the editors of *Life* magazine—are graduates of "the very dear school kept by experience." Although we have only platoon strength in the political warfare area in comparison with the division strength of the Communists, we, nevertheless, have many more experts than we have any right to expect with the present lack of training facilities for this demanding work. We must, however, have many more in the face of the grave and frightful challenge that confronts us, and to achieve the qualitative and quantitative levels required, we must have a training and development institution such as the Freedom Academy.

I am gratified to note that there is a growing recognition among our national leaders of the urgent and important need for systematic and intensive training in the multiple disciplines of political warfare. Exemplary of this growing recognition is a segment of the report submitted to President Eisenhower on December 23, 1960, by the Sprague Committee,<sup>1</sup> composed of distinguished and knowledgeable public servants, which states:

"There is need to provide high-level training in the interrelated economic, political, informational and military aspects of the present world struggle for more of the top officers of agencies dealing with international and security affairs. The committee therefore recommends that consideration be given to the establishment of a National Security Institute for this purpose under the National Security Council, which among other things would provide concentrated exposure to and study of Communist ideology, techniques, and operations worldwide as well as of our total governmental informational

<sup>1</sup> This committee, under the chairmanship of Mansfield D. Sprague, included George V. Allen, Allen W. Dulles, Gordon Gray, Karl G. Harr, Jr., John W. Irwin II, C. D. Jackson, Livingston T. Merchant, and Philip D. Reed.

resources and how best to orchestrate and use them."

The Sprague committee limited its recommendation to the training of high echelon governmental officers, which restricts the number of individuals to be trained much more than does the Freedom Academy proposal. Nevertheless the content and subject matter recommended by the Sprague committee is nearly identical to the course of study envisioned for the Freedom Academy.

It seems to me that there are considerations which argue against the wisdom and economy of limiting this training to just high-level governmental officers. It is true that the most advanced level of training at the Freedom Academy might well be limited to top officers in the national security agencies, but I strongly believe that intermediate and primary curricula should be provided for the training of a wide range of persons in both the public and the private sectors.

To begin with, it will be essential to assemble a distinguished and rather sizable faculty to provide high-caliber political warfare training for even a limited number of top-echelon career officers. And it should be recognized that if training is restricted to upper-echelon officers, the number who can be trained at any one time will be sharply limited, due to the fact that we cannot afford to take large numbers of them off the firing line. This means that we would not be making maximum utilization of the faculty experts, at this most critical juncture in history when our total need for training is so serious that we can ill afford extravagant use of this precious talent.

Add to this the fact that it is not only the policymaker, the planner, and the administrator, but the operator and executor as well, who must comprehend the dimensions of the conflict and the tools and weapons, which victory demands of the participants. From where will we obtain the policymakers and planners of tomorrow, if we are not training and preparing them today?

Last and far from least it would be, in my opinion, a grave error to overlook the need and the considerable desire for training of individuals in the private sector. Is there anyone left today, so naive as to believe that the conflict is exclusively reserved to the public sector? I sincerely hope not. For the fact of the matter is that in the advanced nations of the free world the Communists are directing the major emphasis of their attack at institutions in the private sector. The fundamental nature and the kinetic energy of the Soviet communism require its presence and activity in the private as well as the public sector, for its central aim is the concentration of total social power in the hands of a ruling group. Prof. Philip Selznick, one of our leading students of Bolshevik strategy and tactics, points out in his outstanding book, "The Organizational Weapon," that "the Bolshevik pursuit of power . . . is not limited to the areas where constitutional responsible power is won, but is carried on everywhere in the social structure, wherever an increment of power can be squeezed from control of an institution or a portion of it . . ."

The nature of the challenge facing us and the need for trained personnel to meet the challenge has, I think, been sufficiently delineated. However, justification, for the establishment of a governmentally operated training and development center does not follow ipso facto from the presentation of these two elements of proof. Some may ask, "Do we not already have institutions and programs offering this necessary training?" Others may inquire as to the wisdom of establishing a governmental agency to provide this type of training.

To the first question I must respond with an emphatic "No." It is a fact that there is no institution or agency in the United States

today where an individual can receive broad spectrum training in all of the elements and disciplines of cold war activity. Certain aspects of this total complex of knowledge are offered in some of our leading schools of international affairs. Your own institute here at St. John's is a splendid example of great contributions by a private institution. In the main, however, the courses on communism offered in our private institutions are limited to the history and ideology of communism, thus ignoring the study of the tactics, strategies and organizational weapons of communism, an understanding which is so vitally essential to the person assuming an operational role in the cold war. Many of our private schools of international affairs, especially at the graduate level, provide excellent "area studies" on the Communist bloc. Such curriculums do an outstanding job of backgrounding the student in such important areas of knowledge as surface transportation in the satellite countries or hydroelectric power production in the Soviet Union. But important as this training is, it does not expose the student to the nature of the conflict nor does it instruct him in the tactical and operational skills so that he can employ his substantive knowledge usefully in the cold war. Nor does such training in a private institution carry any assurance the individuals who are trained will thereafter be appointed to services in which their skills can be fully utilized.

Perhaps the closest we come today to providing the training proposed for presentation to public officials at the Freedom Academy is in the courses offered by the armed services' war colleges. These courses are extensive, but since political warfare training is necessarily and properly secondary to the main training missions of these institutions it must be dealt with in a rather broad and summary manner, often assuming a level of sophistication not yet attained by the student. Such training is simply not adequate for our needs today. Additionally the training offered by the various war colleges suffers from the same weakness which I see in the Sprague committee's recommendation in that it is available to only a very limited number outside the Military Establishment.

The entire gamut of governmental and private training programs in the area of cold war know-how has been reviewed by men eminently qualified to assess the qualitative and quantitative content of these curriculums. It is their conclusion that there is no single institution where all of the bits and pieces are brought together for instructional presentation in a comprehensive and all-encompassing discipline.

So we need a central comprehensive cold war training institution, but we still haven't answered the individual who questions the wisdom of locating such an agency in the Federal structure.

In the main, this individual casts a critical eye at this proposal, for he sees the Freedom Academy as a governmental institution for the propounding and propagation of dogma—a Federal factory for the production of a pat and inflexible ideology of freedom. If this were, in fact, the intent and proposed mission of the Freedom Academy, there would be no one who would oppose this proposal more vigorously than KARL E. MÜNCH, of South Dakota. I have my individual concepts of freedom. Each member of this audience has his, and I dare say that no two of our concepts of freedom are identical in every respect—for this is the very essence of a free pluralistic society. The Freedom Academy proposal is premised on a perception of the conceptual multiformity of our American society and on a recognition that totalitarian communism is antithetical to every concept of freedom.

It should be clearly understood that the Freedom Academy's primary role will not be

that of educating individuals in the varied conceptual content of democratic ideology. This is a task which, in the main, must be left to our secondary schools and to our private and State colleges and universities. The major mission of the Academy will be to give the student of comprehensive understanding of Communist ideology, tactics and strategies, and then to teach the student the proper tactics to be employed by us in defeating the power-seeking thrusts of the Communists and in achieving our other national goals through the inter-related use of economic, ideological, diplomatic, informational and paramilitary programs. Considering the complexity and intricacy of the multiple disciplines which will be presented in this training program, I have no fears that it will become a program for indoctrination in dogma and pat answers. For to attempt the reduction of this vast array of knowledge to a group of general rules and a fixed body of doctrine would be as futile an exercise as trying to reduce the science of nuclear physics to a few simple algebraic equations.

It seems to me, therefore, that the whole question of whether a Freedom Academy will or will not be established hinges primarily on the desire of the American people to effectively resist the relentless assault of communism on the free world. Without the desire the training will be useless. With the desire the training may well be decisive.

As I noted at the beginning of my address, history teaches that in a contest between freedom and tyranny the outcome depends not nearly so much on the quantity and quality of the assault on freedom as it does on the quantity and quality of freedom's response to that assault. To emphasize this point, let me, in closing, return briefly to another incident in the Athenian experience.

In 351 B.C., Rhodes, which had once been part of the Athenian confederacy, was trying desperately to throw off the autocratic rule imposed upon it by Caria, a tributary of the Persian dominion. The democratic party of Rhodes appealed to Athens for help, and Demosthenes, in one of the most statesmen like acts of his career, supported their application. He failed, but in his effort he left a valuable lesson for all future generations of free nations. In his plea for the Rhodians, he warned Athens that the cause of political freedom was everywhere her own, and that, wherever that cause was forsaken, there a new danger was created for the independence of Athens.

It has been less than 5 years since the cries for help rang out to the free world from the streets of Budapest. On that occasion we were obliged to forsake the cause of freedom, because we were not prepared to do otherwise.

Since then, other areas of the world—some near at hand and some remote—have witnessed freedom fail and tyranny triumph. Clearly new devices must be developed and new cold war techniques must be employed to turn the tides of victory in the right direction.

We must, therefore, without delay, set in motion the wheels of preparation, for it is, indeed, true that the cause of political freedom is everywhere our own, and we can ill afford to forsake that cause in the future, or to trust our success to those who are inadequately trained to carry out programs of such paramount importance that civilization itself cannot outlive their failure.

#### REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 148) opposing Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1961.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the proposed resolution would have the effect



of rejecting the President's proposals for reorganization of the Securities and Exchange Commission. In its report on Senate Resolution 148 the Committee on Government Operations states:

The proposals contained in plan No. 1 of 1961 involve matters of serious and far-reaching importance and effect which require far more study and deliberation than was possible under the time limitations imposed upon the committee by the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

The report goes on to state that the Government Operations Committee found the issues involved very complex and "so difficult to resolve in the time available, that an initial motion to report Senate Resolution 148 favorably failed of passage by a vote of three in favor and three opposed, primarily because some members felt they needed further deliberation before reaching a conclusion. The motion to report the resolution without recommendation carried by a vote of four in favor and two opposed.

This is a far-reaching proposal which requires deliberate and considerate study. The admission of the Government Operations Committee that it did not have sufficient time for such study is a powerful argument against action today which would put the President's reorganization plan into operation.

Our administrative agencies are plagued with many problems. But a sound solution of these problems will not be advanced by ramming a Presidential proposal through Congress. I would fully support steps truly designed to make the independent agencies more efficient and effective, but I emphatically disagree with the President's proposal in this field.

These agencies exercise powers delegated to them by Congress. They were never intended to function as pawns of the Chief Executive. There are many ways of improving their procedures without impairing their independence.

Under section 1 of plan No. 1, the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission could be empowered to assign the agency's functions to subordinate divisions, individual Commissioners, hearing examiners, or other employees of the Commission. Under this procedure the Chairman would become a one-man czar over the agency. It would be possible for him to relegate Commissioners and other agency personnel who did not agree with his policy or philosophy to mere figureheads or errand boys. The Commission's functions as an effective, nonpartisan, deliberative body where all sides of a particular issue are presented, discussed, and considered, would be seriously imperiled.

Plan No. 1 also would substantially reduce the right of appeal within the Securities and Exchange Commission. Under the plan, the right of review would be discretionary with the Commission. Unless the Commission decided to review a case on its own motion, there would be no review unless a majority, less one member of the Commission, voted for review. Should the Commission decline to exercise its discretionary review or no review is sought within the

time limitations provided, the action of the subordinate who has exercised the functions of the Commission will for all purposes be final and deemed the action of the Commission. This drastic limitation on agency review certainly should be given more study than is possible in acting on a reorganization plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the limitation of administrative review within the agency would also have the effect of increasing the burden on our courts. Under the present procedure the Commission reviews initial decisions of its subordinates and has full power to correct improper interpretations of the law and takes whatever action the facts in the record may warrant. This opportunity to correct errors frequently avoids the necessity of judicial review. In effect, the courts would now be required to deal with cases which could have been finally disposed of by the agency itself.

Plan No. 1 also raises the danger that the American public will be denied access to information that it should have a right to know. Under title 15, United States Code, section 80-b10, the Securities and Exchange Commission may keep secret certain information filed with it under the provisions of the Investment Advisers Act, if the Commission decides that disclosure of this information is neither necessary nor appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors. Other statutes administered by the SEC contain similar provisions. The power of delegation covered by section 1 of the President's plan includes the function of determining whether information shall be disclosed to the public under the provisions of the statute I have just related. Delegation of such a power to a subordinate of an agency would, in fact, vest the power in the Chairman since the Chairman would be responsible for the assignment of all personnel.

The provisions of the plan could also exclude the minority party members from deliberation as to what information should be made available to the public. By so doing, it would be possible for documents and other reports to be concealed, which should be disclosed. Anyone concerned with freedom of information certainly should be reluctant to support a plan with such potential for mischief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have long advocated constructive changes in administrative agency practice. In that connection I expect to introduce shortly a bill which has the support of the American Bar Association to establish a new Office of Federal Administrative Practice. This new unit would provide independent and authoritative surveillance of all agency proceedings. It would serve the administrative agencies of the Government in the same way as the present Administrative Office of the

U.S. Courts has served the Federal courts. It would also work for uniform agency rules and recommend, after thorough study, changes needed to shorten and cut the tremendous costs and time now required in administrative proceedings. Such an office would not be under the control of either the executive or legislative branch of Government, and would not serve in any way to undermine the independence of the agencies. This is the way to cut down on administrative agency inefficiency without imperiling needed safeguards and procedures.

Mr. President, I shall vote against this reorganization plan and in favor of Senate Resolution 148, but I hope that Congress will see fit on another occasion to take constructive and thoughtful action on the problems in this field.

#### THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to submit several amendments to S. 1726, the administration's bill to extend and expand the National Defense Education Act, which is now pending before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I therefore ask the unanimous consent that my amendments be printed and referred to that committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be received and printed, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, when the bill which became the National Defense Education Act was reported to the Senate in 1958, my minority views consisted of a half dozen lines which I would like to quote because of their appropriateness at this time. Here is what I said on that occasion:

This bill and the foregoing remarks of the majority remind me of an old Arabian proverb: "If the camel once gets his nose in the tent, his body will soon follow."

If adopted, the legislation will mark the inception of aid, supervision, and ultimately control of education in this country by Federal authorities.

Mr. President, normally nothing is more keenly exhilarating than to be able to say "I told you so." But the accuracy of my forecast fills me with deep foreboding—I would much rather have been proven a false prophet. A few weeks ago this body passed a wide-ranging Federal aid-to-education bill for which no need existed, which was inequitable and discriminatory, which increases Federal spending and hence the forces of inflation, and what is most disturbing, which constitutes a serious invasion by the Federal Government into an area, where both traditionally and constitutionally, the States and the local communities have heretofore exercised an exclusive jurisdiction.

Now the administration is pushing for a measure which will add further to inflationary pressures and will broaden the